

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
AMUND DRESALE REYNOLDS,  
  
Defendant.

Case No. CR09-188-RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
FOR EARLY  
TERMINATION OF  
SUPERVISED RELEASE

This matter comes before the Court on defendant's "Motion for Early Termination of Supervised Release." (Dkt. # 55).

On June 10, 2009, defendant pleaded guilty to (i) one count of possession of cocaine base in the form of crack cocaine with the intent to distribute (greater than five grams), in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(B)(iii) and (ii) one count of felon in possession of a firearm, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). Dkt. # 17. On November 20, 2009, the Court sentenced defendant to 96 months of imprisonment and five years of supervised release. Dkt. # 26. On June 7, 2013, the Court reduced defendant's sentence to 92 months of imprisonment and five years of supervised release. Dkt. # 29. On December 8, 2014, the Court again reduced defendant's sentence to time served and five years of supervised release. Dkt. # 32. Defendant started his initial term of supervised release on October 30, 2015. Dkt. # 33. On February 16, 2018, defendant admitted guilt to committing a new law violation (assault 3<sup>rd</sup> degree) before Hon. Mary Alice Theiler. Dkt. # 43. On March 1, 2018, the Court revoked defendant's term of supervised release and committed him to a term of 24 months of imprisonment followed by

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR EARLY  
TERMINATION OF SUPERVISED RELEASE - 1


1 three years of supervised release. Dkts. # 49, 50. Defendant's current term of supervised  
2 release commenced on January 15, 2020. Dkt. # 52.

3 The Court may "after considering the factors set forth in [18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)] . . .  
4 terminate a term of supervised release and discharge the defendant released at any time after the  
5 expiration of one year of supervised release . . . if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by  
6 the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice." 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e). The  
7 Court enjoys "discretion to consider a wide range of circumstances when determining whether  
8 to grant early termination." United States v. Emmett, 749 F.3d 817, 819 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing  
9 United States v. Pregent, 190 F.3d 279, 283 (4th Cir. 1999)).

10 The Court is pleased to learn of defendant's generally positive performance on supervised  
11 release, including his stable employment and commitment to his family. However, the Court  
12 finds that defendant's request to terminate supervised release is premature. See 18 U.S.C.  
13 §§ 3583(e)(1), 3553(a). Accordingly, defendant's request for early termination of supervised  
14 release (Dkt. # 55) is DENIED. Nonetheless, if defendant remains free of any supervised  
15 release violations in the coming months, the Court will entertain a renewed motion for early  
16 termination of supervised release noted for July 1, 2022.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18  
19 DATED this 24<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2022.  
20

21  
22   
23 Robert S. Lasnik  
24 United States District Judge  
25  
26  
27  
28